

Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	09/822,693		ROBERTS ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Jonathan S. Crepeau		1746	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jonathan S. Crepeau. (3) ____.
- (2) Michael Harlin. (4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 July 2003.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Wilkinson et al. '448.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner left message with attorney stating that claim 1 was erroneously indicated as allowable in the previous Office action and that a statement of common ownership with patent 6,096,448 would need to be filed to maintain allowance of claim 1. Examiner also requested authorization to shorten abstract by examiner's amendment. Examiner indicated that a non-final rejection would be mailed if these issues could not be resolved in a timely manner. Attorney did not return the Examiner's call in a timely manner.